



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,440	12/31/2003	Gregory Joseph Badros	24207-10067	8962
.62296	7590	12/21/2006	EXAMINER	
GOOGLE / FENWICK SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA ST. MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/21/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,440	BADROS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Etienne P. LeRoux	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/31/2003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Status

Claims 1-58 are pending. Claims 1-58 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hienet: A User-Centered Approach for Automatic Link Generation: Daniel T. Chang (hereafter Chang).

Claim 1, 11, 14 and 15:

Chang discloses:

receiving an interest signal indicating an interest in a hyperlink contained in a first document [link icon indicates traversable links, Fig 5]

generating a request signal comprising a request for third-party-provided information [Hienet, abstract] about a second document associated with the hyperlink [users can control the link generation parameters [abstract]

receiving the third-party-provided information; and causing the third-party-provided information to be output in association with the first document [order of the list is the result of the relevance ranking, Fig 5]

Claim 3:

Chang discloses user-related information [link profile, page 146]

Claim 4:

Chang discloses wherein the user-related information comprises query-related information [link profile, page 146].

Claims 5 and 6:

Chang discloses wherein the third-party-provided information comprises a content snippet of the second document [Figure 5].

Claim 7:

Chang discloses wherein the third-party-provided information comprises past-user information [user experiences, abstract].

Claim 8:

Chang discloses wherein the past-user information comprises a user-supplied rating of the second document [user filter, page 151]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of

Pub No US 2005/0044224 issued to Jun et al (hereafter Jun).

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 2:

Chang discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not disclose logging the interest signal. Jun discloses logging the interest signal [paragraph 256]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang to include logging the interest signal as taught by Jun for the purpose of maintaining a record of a user's visit to the website.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Pub No US 2003/0014399 issued to Hansen et al (hereafter Hansen)

Claim 9:

Chang discloses the elements of claims 1 and 7 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the past-user information comprises at least one of: a period of linger time, a quantity of repeat visits, a quantity of repeat queries, and a quantity of click-throughs. Hansen discloses wherein the past-user information comprises at least one of: a period of linger time, a quantity of repeat visits, a quantity of repeat queries, and a quantity of click-throughs [paragraph 7]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang to include wherein the past-user information comprises at least one of: a period of linger time, a quantity of repeat visits, a quantity of repeat queries, and a quantity of click-throughs as taught by Hansen for the purpose of monitoring user activities during a search.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Pub No US 2002/0002438 issued to Ohmura et al (hereafter Ohmura).

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 10:

Chang discloses the elements of claims 1 and 7 as noted above but does not disclose a genre of the second document. Ohmura discloses a genre of the second document [Fig 5, paragraph 76]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang to include a genre of the second document as taught by Ohmura for the purpose of locating a restaurant of choice [paragraph 76]

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Pub No 2003/0135413 issued to Nishi et al (hereafter Nishi).

Claim 12:

Chang discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not disclose liveness of the second document. Nishi discloses liveness of the second document [paragraph 96]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang to include liveness of the second document as taught by Nishi for the purpose of determining a most-recently visited website.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of US Pat No 6,718,363 issued to Ponte (hereafter Ponte).

Claim 13:

Chang discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not disclose a measure of disruptiveness of the second document. Ponte discloses a measure of disruptiveness of the second document [term required to be absent, paragraph 147]. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2161

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang to include a measure of disruptiveness of the second document as taught by Ponte for the purpose of providing undesirable document with a low ranking [paragraph 147].

Claims 16, 17, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Applicant Admitted prior art (AAPA).

Regarding claims 18, 19, 21-26 and 28, Official Notice is taken that elements in such claims are well-known and expected in the art.

Regarding claims 29-58, such claims can be rejected over the prior art made of record.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Etienne LeRoux

12/15/2006

EP LeRoux
primary examiner